WWW.SCMUSLIM.COM

THE GREATEST LIES EVER TOLD!!!

The title of this document by itself is an attention-getter. As such, one might assume that the premise of this document is to expose an act of injustice against a specific individual or event from world history. In fact, the issue at hand is more severe than that!

Many people across this planet, especially monotheistic religious folk among the Jews and Christians are of the belief that the true name of "God" has been lost. As such, one must refer to the creator by using either generic titles such as God or modified attributive titles such as Lord or the Good Master.

So, how did mankind arrive at this point of confusion? Many purport that the name of God was too holy to pronounce; as a result, over the ages man simply forgot how to pronounce this name. Among the Jews, this unspeakable name is the most important name of God in Judaism; which is commonly known as the Tetragrammaton (Yod-Heh-Waw-Heh; i.e., YHWH), the four-letter name of God in Hebrew. Now, the first thought that should enter one's mind is how it can be possible to forget the true name of God while the people to whom this name was revealed, still retains the language of their forefathers? It is for example

like saying that the true name for the creator among English-speaking peoples is the three letter consonantal word "GOD." As long as mankind possesses the English language, anyone fluent in this language should be able to accurately pronounce this name.

Another question also arises; namely, if the true name of God was too holy to pronounce, why then did God reveal it in the first place? Also, why did Jesus (peace be unto him) instruct his followers to pray to God in a manner that showed reverence to his name? In Matthew 6:9 regarding the Our Father's Prayer, Jesus reportedly said: "**This, then, is how you should pray: 'Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name...'**" The word hallowed in this verse according to the footnotes of www.biblegateway.com means: Or Let your name be kept holy, or Let your name be treated with reverence. One can therefore deduce that the directive to keep God's name holy is self-explanatory; i.e., not to use it in a frivolous manner such as with profanity, and the word reverence can be defined as a feeling or attitude of deep respect tinged with awe - veneration.

Nowhere does the creator give man the directive that his name should not be uttered. In fact, God says that he is very jealous regarding giving reverence to others over him; such as honoring a judge in a court of law, despite the fact that they often hypocritically make the parties in the court swear on the

bible, and then in the same setting, make ruling which contradict the very doctrines and laws contained within.

If one truly desires to show reverence to God, they should make an honest attempt to solve the mystery of the lost name in question. To begin this mission, it would be practical to start with Adam and Eve (peace be upon both of them), since they were the first humans to appear on earth. Furthermore, according to the bible in Genesis 11:1, all the people on earth initially spoke one language. Thereafter, God divided the people via forcing them to speak new languages. However, it is only logical to believe that at least one of the descendents of Adam and Eve (peace be upon both of them) retained their mother-tongue; and from a historical perspective, this mother-tongue could not have been the Hebrew language.

According to the bible in Genesis 2:10 - 14, the Garden of Eden in which Adam and Eve (peace be upon both of them) dwelled had a river which divided into four branches: "**The name of the first is the Pishon; it winds through the entire land of Havilah, where there is gold; the name of the second river is the Gihon; it winds through the entire land of Cush; the name of the third river is the Tigris; it runs along the east side of Asshur; and the fourth river is the Euphrates.**" In light of this information, it is important to note that all four of these

river branches have one thing in common; namely, the Arabic language. Sure, there are other dialects spoken among the peoples that inhabit the lands in which these rivers flow; but, I feel like it is more than a coincidence that most of those lands are Arab nations.

By now, I guess that you are asking yourselves, where is the author going with this? I am merely attempting to establish the foundation of my discourse. It is just interesting to me that Arabic is a dominant language throughout the lands mentioned, but no biblical scholar would dare say that Arabic might have been the original language of the Garden of Eden; thus, making the lost name of God "Allah."

Once I go on record saying that the true name of God is Allah, years of religious programming will prevent many a Christian or Jew from even considering this suggestion as a fact. In all fairness, I actually understand your apprehension. For years, and in some instances, generations, American Christians have been told that Allah is the God of the Muslims; and since Muslims do not believe in Jesus as being God on earth, as being part of the trinity, or dying for the sins of humanity, many a Christian would say that there is no way possible for Allah to be the true name of the Creator.

With this being said, all in doubt should ask themselves, what then do Arab Christians call the Creator? You might be surprised, to discover that the fact of the matter is that they call the Creator Allah. Furthermore, Allah is an actual name for the Creator, whereas, words such as God, Lord, and even Creator are generic titles that can apply to other individuals. The word god can be applied to a god-father or mother. The word lord can be applied to several individuals, including the authoritative figure in a land/apartment leasing agreement; i.e., a landlord; and the term creator can be applied to anyone who invents something.

Ironically, the use of a capital letter at the beginning of the words listed above is the only way that a reader can distinguish between referring to an ordinary man and the Creator himself. With this being said, one should be aware of the fact that the earliest revelations of God came to man through means other than books. Therefore, it would have been impossible to distinguish a reference to God from a false god; since there are no capital letters in Hebrew.

Take 2 Corinthians 4:4 for example. This verse reads: **"In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."** In this verse,

the only way to distinguish Satan from the true God is the use of the capital letter "G." Without this capital letter, since mankind has been informed that there is only one God, one could be influenced to believe that Satan and God are the same. I am just pointing this out to make a point; because, there is no educated person on earth who would ever take this verse to suggest that Satan and God are the same being.

Semitic languages like Hebrew and Arabic have words which specifically are addressed to the real God and a false god. For example, Allah is the name of the one true God in Arabic; whereas, ilah is a generic term for a god (diety). The generic word for a god in Hebrew is elah. As you can see, there is very little difference. So, in 2 Corinthians 4:4, the Hebrew word used for "the god of this world" and the word used for "the image of God" would not be the same; i.e., distinguishing the two would not be accomplished by using a lower or upper cased letter. The intent of the translators is to disconnect the reader from any opportunity to ponder over the fact that Arabic and Hebrew are sister languages; and why is there no true name for God located anywhere in any translation of any bible.

The point that I am trying to make to the skeptics is that how do you explain the fact that Abraham, who was from modern day Iraq where Arabic is the official language, had a wife

(Hagar) who was Egyptian, a land where the official language is Arabic; Moses, who is the central figure of the Jews and Judaism, who was also an Egyptian, and even Jesus, who was raised in Egypt, where he hid among the people without being detected as a foreigner, and even studied among the Essenes, could somehow spend their entire lifetime not speaking Arabic or calling God Allah? Ironically, in Aramaic, a language which the bible depicts Jesus as speaking, the name for God is Allaha. Does is sound familiar? The name for God in Aramaic is nearly identical to the Arabic name, Allah. Furthermore, all of the above mentioned lands in which the rivers branching from the Garden of Eden traveled, all use the name Allah to refer to the Creator.

Another point worth mentioning is that despite the fact that monotheistic religions such as Judaism and Christianity are attributed to the Prophets Moses and Jesus (Peace be upon both of them), the followers of these faiths as a norm, do not emulate them in practice; meaning, every prophet of God prostrated during prayer as Muslims do, they all maintained the law of growing a beard for men and covering the head for females. They did not eat pork, and even buried their dead in the same was as Muslims do today.

Why then are we not united; or better yet, following the same way of life? The Jews accepted Moses revelation and claimed to be God's chosen; however, they adamantly rejected Jesus as the Messiah. Interestingly enough, we Muslims accept both Moses and Jesus as Prophets of God; and even accept Jesus as the Messiah, as highlighted in Surah (chapter) 3:45 of the Quran which reads: "**Behold! The angels said: 'O Mary! Allah gives thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ (Messiah) Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah.**" However, despite accepting Jesus as the Messiah, the alleged followers of Jesus (Christians) adamantly reject Mohammed (peace be upon him) as a Prophet of God; even though 1 John 5:1 clearly says that the spirit (person) who testifies that Jesus is the Christ (Messiah) is of God.

See the irony? Christians are falling into the same trap as the Jews; i.e., choosing to reject a Prophet of God when the scriptures clearly say that the forthcoming Prophet of God must be followed. For those who deny that the bible prophesizes a prophet in addition to the coming of Jesus, I suggest they read John 1:19 – 21 which says: "**Now this was John's testimony when the Jews of Jerusalem sent priests and Levites to ask him who he was. He did not fail to confess, but confessed freely, 'I am not**

the Christ.' They asked him, 'Then who are you? Are you Elijah?' He said, 'I am not.' 'Are you the Prophet?' He answered, 'No.'"

Based on the above mentioned verses, there were three individuals that the people were expecting to appear; i.e., Elijah, the Christ (Messiah), and the final Prophet of God. Now the bible clears up the confusion when is says that Elijah had already come but the people were unaware of this fact (Matthew 17:12). Further, everyone knows that Jesus is the Christ; however, I have yet to meet a Christian who could tell me who is the Prophet that John 1:21 is inquiring about; yet, the all declare that the Prophet is not Mohammed.

A final point about the Prophet in question whom Muslims believe is Mohammed, who revealed the Quran, i.e., God's final revelation to mankind; if one were to listen to the prophecy of Jesus regarding the comforter, Jesus makes it clear that there are many things that he has to show the people. However, at that point in time, the people were unable to bear them. Nonetheless, as Jesus later said, he must leave in order for the comforter to come. If he did not go to the Father, the comforter would not come on his behalf. The evidence: John 16:7 - 15, "**Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: <u>for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you</u>; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he**

will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that* shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He will bring glory to me by taking from what is mine and making it known to you."

As for those who say that this and the other verses pertaining to the comforter is actually referring to the Holy Ghost, I suggest they pay close attention to the words: "**For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you.**" Therefore, it is clear that Jesus had to leave in order for the comforter to arrive. Furthermore, in John 1:32 the Holy Ghost landed on Jesus in the form of a dove when he was baptized by John the Baptist. Thus, the Holy Ghost cannot be the comforter that Jesus is referring to, since they existed simultaneously in the above mentioned verse. In addition, whenever the Holy Ghost is mentioned, the bible refers to it as "it;" however, the comforter is referred to as "he." Thus, based on the evidence

from the bible, the comforter/Prophet is a human-being that will arrive after Jesus.

Lastly, Jesus said that the comforter would show mankind many things. Therefore, if Mohammed is not the comforter, and if it is in fact the Holy Ghost as many Christians claim, please ask yourself to name one thing that the Holy Ghost has told Christians since Jesus left; because, Jesus is quoted as saying that the Holy Ghost will show mankind "many" things.

Among the many narrations of Islam's Prophet Mohammed regarding the return of Jesus, includes the following: A hadith in the collection of Bukhari from Al-Layth who related it from Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri who reportedly heard it from Sa'id bin al-Musayyab who in turn heard it from Abu Hurayrah: **"God's Messenger (P.B.U.H.) said: 'By him in whose hands my soul is, (Jesus) son of Mary will descend amongst you shortly as a just ruler and will break the cross (a graven image used in Christianity) and kill the pig (which Christians have made lawful to eat despite the fact that the bible says not to consume its flesh or touch its carcass) and abolish the jizyah (a tax of approximately one dinar/$4.00 USD which non-Muslims known as dhimmi, who live in Muslim lands are required to pay annually instead of paying zakat as Muslims do, in order to honor their covenant with the Muslims; i.e., not to fight**

against them or commit treason; in return they are free to practice their Christian/Jewish beliefs). Wealth will flow (in such abundance that) nobody will accept (any charitable gifts)." Furthermore, a hadith collected by Imam Muslim reports "**... As the antichrist spreads fitnah (trials and tribulations), Almighty Allah will send the Prophet Jesus the son of Mary ... The Prophet Jesus will meet the antichrist at the gate of Ludd (a region near Jerusalem) and will destroy him.**" Thus, not only do Muslims believe that Jesus will return in the final days and purify the earth, we also believe that he is the only person who can kill the Antichrist; not to mention, the 19th chapter of the Quran is titled Maryam (Mary), in honor of Mary, the mother of Jesus.

In closing, I hope that every reader is willing to validate my statements and see the truth behind my message. If not, I guess that we will have to agree to disagree! Furthermore, I suggest the followers of the Bible take heed of Mark 7:7, which reads: "**But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men;" in addition to Matthew 7:21 - 23 which reads: "Not everyone that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name**

have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Iniquity in this instance pertains to claiming to follow Jesus externally by doing good deeds in the name of Christianity, while choosing to deny Mohammed and Islam while knowing full well that they both meet the criteria described by Jesus and the Prophets of God; like the Prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:15 - 22 which only applies to Mohammed. The New American Bible verifies this point with the following footnote: "**16 [21] Elijah: the Baptist did not claim to be Elijah returned to earth (cf ⇒ Malachi 3:23; ⇒ Matthew 11:14). The Prophet: probably the prophet like Moses (⇒ Deut 18:15; cf ⇒ Acts 3:22)**." Therefore, since the Christ (Jesus) is mentioned in John 1:20, and the Bible footnote says that the Prophet mentioned in John 1:21 is probably the same from the prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:15 - 22, there is no way possible for it to be about Jesus; because, he cannot be both the expected Prophet and Messiah (Christ); i.e., I am not aware of a single Christian who claims that Jesus is the Prophet from John 1:21. (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon every Prophet and the righteous among their families.)

The Lie that Isaac was the son that Prophet Abraham (P.B.U.H.) was ordered to sacrifice, and that Hagar and her son Ishmael were abandoned

It is a common belief among the vast majority of Jews and Christians that Isaac was the son that Prophet Abraham (P.B.U.H.) was ordered by God to sacrifice, and that Hagar and her son Ishmael (peace be upon both of them) were abandoned. I elected to address this issue because, contrary to popular belief, all Abrahamic monotheistic faiths are of the belief that Prophet Abraham (P.B.U.H.) was ordered to sacrifice his son and remove his second wife Hagar and her child, Ishmael (peace be upon both of them) from his household and leave them in the desert. However, there is a difference of opinion among Muslims; in that, we believe Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) to be the son chosen for sacrifice, and that Hagar and he son (peace be upon both of them) were not abandoned; rather left in the desert due to Prophet Abraham (P.B.U.H.) carrying out a directive from God.

What then, one may ask is the basis for my discourse. My theory is based on evidences found in biblical sources and as well as Islamic sources. The Bible says in Genesis 22:1 – 3, "**And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt**

Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham: and he said, Behold, here I am. And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of. And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering, and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him." In these verses, it is extremely clear that the son in question is Isaac (P.B.U.H.). The Quran on the other hand says in Surah 37:102 - 105: "**Then, when (the son Ishmael) reached (the age of) (serious) work with him, he said: 'O my son! I see in vision that I offer thee in sacrifice: Now see what thy view is!' (The son) said: 'O my father! Do as thou art commanded: thou will find me, if Allah so wills one practicing Patience and Constancy!' So when they had both submitted their wills (to Allah), and he had laid him prostrate on his forehead (for sacrifice), We called out to him 'O Abraham!' 'Thou hast already fulfilled the vision!' - 'thus indeed do We reward those who do right.'**"

As one can see, we have the same event, yet there are two entirely different individuals being the son to be sacrificed. The Quran does not specifically mention Ishmael's name in this

verse, but the ahadith, which are the sources which documented the actions, sayings, and deeds of Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) does. Now, under the laws of deduction, both sides cannot be correct; therefore, either both sides are incorrect in their assessment, or one is correct leaving the other incorrect. After a careful examination of all available evidence, I am forced to side with the Islamic version of the incident.

As evidence supporting my position, I urge the reader to view "THE PENTATEUCH" section of the introduction from the "The New American Bible (Style No. 2403): Student Edition (ISBN 0-529-06089-2)." Paragraph three of the "THE PENTATEUCH" section of the introduction from the bible reads: "***However, even this analysis of the Pentateuch is an over-simplification, for it is not always possible to distinguish with certainty among the various sources. The fact is that each of these individual traditions incorporates much older material. The Yahwist was himself a collector and adapter. His narrative is made up of many disparate stories that have been reoriented, and given a meaning within the context in which they now stand; e.g., <u>the story of Abraham and Isaac in Gen 22</u>. Within the J and P traditions one has to reckon with many individual units; these had their own history and life-setting before they were brought together into the present more or less connected narrative.***"

This information can also be viewed online at: http://old.usccb.org/nab/bible/pentateuch.htm

Now in light of the above mentioned information from the New American Bible, one has to consider the fact that the statements contained within the Pentateuch (first five books of the Bible) section of the introduction sheds a great deal of light on the conflicting versions of the sacrifice story contained within the Bible and Quran. With this being said, one should place a great deal of emphasis on the keyword "reoriented." The word reoriented is the past-tense of reorient, which is defined as: "To adjust or align (something) in a new or different way." Thus, it is safe for one to assume that based on evidence contained from within the Bible itself, the story of the sacrifice from Genesis 22 has been changed from the way in which it was originally revealed.

Additional evidence from the Bible proving that the son to be sacrificed was Ishmael and not Isaac (Peace be upon them) is found in Genesis 22:12, which reads: "**And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me." Note the keywords "only son.**" Now, based solely on this verse, it would be impossible for Isaac

(P.B.U.H.) to be Abraham's (P.B.U.H.) only son; since Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) was thirteen years older than Isaac (P.B.U.H.).

It is an established fact that at one point in time, a period of thirteen years to be specific, Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) was actually Abraham's (P.B.U.H.) only son. With this being said, it is important to note that there are those who strongly detest the fact that Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) was the sacrificial son; so much so, that they conjured up the lie that Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) was actually an illegitimate son of Abraham (P.B.U.H.), and as such, he was not entitled to any birthright. To these allegations, I would ask the perpetrators to produce their proof if they are truthful.

If one is truly sincere about learning the truth, they would take a few moments and read the bible to see what the verses actually say. For example, In Genesis 16:1 – 3, the bible reads: "**Now Sarai Abram's wife bare him no children: and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar. And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold now, the LORD hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai. And Sarai Abram's wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his wife**." Now, as one can clearly see,

Abraham's union with Hagar (peace be upon them) was through a lawful marriage; thus, making Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) a legitimate son in the eyes of God. Furthermore, for those who still feel as though Abraham's union with Hagar (peace be upon them) was illegal in the eyes of God, since he had more than one wife, I suggest they focus on Deuteronomy 15:15 – 16, which reads: "**If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have born him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the firstborn son be hers that was hated: Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved firstborn before the son of the hated, which is indeed the firstborn: But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the firstborn, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath: for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the firstborn is his.**" Thus, Ishmael is the child of a lawful marriage.

I also feel it necessary to shed some light on the lineage of Ishmael's mother, Hagar (peace be upon them); since, most Christians I have communicated with refer to her as an insignificant figure. I honestly cannot say that the bible attempts to diminish her stature, but I cannot help from feeling this way; especially, when the evidence highlighting the fact that she was an Egyptian princess is totally hidden from the

texts of the current bible. Furthermore, the very evidence which mentions this detail is even deemed an apocryphal source. The source that I am referring to is the Book of Jasher, chapter 15:29 – 32 which reads: "**And in the morning the king called for Abram and said to him, What is this thou hast done to me? Why didst thou say, She is my sister, owing to which I took her unto me for a wife, and this heavy plague has therefore come upon me and my household. Now therefore here is thy wife, take her and go from our land lest we all die on her account. And Pharaoh took more cattle, men servants and maid servants, and silver and gold, to give to Abram, and he returned unto him Sarai his wife. And the king took a maiden whom he begat by his concubines, and he gave her to Sarai for a handmaid. And the king said to his daughter, It is better for thee my daughter to be a handmaid in this man's house than to be mistress in my house, after we have beheld the evil that befell us on account of this woman.**" A similar view is even found among Jewish sources (Midrash) which can be viewed online at: http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/7021-hagar under —In Rabbinical Literature, which reads: "According to the Midrash (Gen. R. xlv.), Hagar was the daughter of Pharaoh, who, seeing what great miracles God had done for Sarah's sake (Gen. xii. 17), said: '**It is better for Hagar to be a slave in Sarah's house than mistress in her own.**'"

In light of the above mentioned information, I feel like an honest reader will agree that Hagar and Ishmael (peace be upon them) are deserving of the honor entitled to them; especially, since God elected to have their story mentioned in scripture; whereas, none of us on earth today can make a similar claim.

While on the subject of restoring their honor, I consider it only appropriate to reiterate the fact that Hagar and Ishmael (peace be upon them) were not abandoned. Let us start with the story of Isaac's (P.B.U.H.) weaning party; which customarily ends after two years and six months. If one were to read Genesis 21:8 – 21, which says: "**And the child grew, and was weaned: and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned. And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed. And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto**

Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot: for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lift up her voice, and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water; and she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad drink. And God was with the lad; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt.”

I am aware that the verses listed are substantial; however, I needed to provide a great deal of detailed information from the incident to support my position. With this being said, the point that I will attempt to make is that the biblical version of the story is inconsistent with its own verses, and as such, I

can only see the matter as being another reoriented work of biblical collectors and adaptors.

Take for example, the timeframe in which Hagar and Ishmael (peace be upon them) are instructed to leave. The incident happened at Isaac's (P.B.U.H.) weaning party, at which point he should have been approximately two years of age. Therefore, according to the Bible, Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) would have been around age fifteen or sixteen. However, according to the verses comprising the incident, Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) is depicted as being a child so small/young that his mother was given their supplies to carry in preference of him. Furthermore, his mother gave him water from the bottle verses allowing him to hold the bottle for himself, as if he was unable to do so. It is also important to note the fact that when they ran out of water he was depicted as crying, as in the case of an infant, and being small enough to be shielded by a single shrub.

I am merely saying that it can only be one or the other; either the incident occurred at a much earlier point in time, when Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) was in fact an infant; and while those who reoriented the episode dated the incident at Isaac's (P.B.U.H.) weaning party without realizing the conflict between the actual age of Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) in relation to the story portrayed. If fact, the description of the event, minus the

timeframe in which it occurred during Ishmael's (P.B.U.H.) life, is nearly identical to the event narrated in Islamic sources.

In the tafsir (explanation of a Surah) of Surah Ibrahim (Abraham) regarding verse 14:37 which reads: **"O our Lord! I have made some of my offspring to dwell in a valley without cultivation, by Thy Sacred House; in order, O our Lord, that they may establish regular Prayer: so fill the hearts of some among men with love towards them, and feed them with fruits: so that they may give thanks**." Ibn Kathir listed a hadith narrated by Ibn Abbas which provided detailed information about the events surrounding the verse in question, which reads: "**The first lady to use a girdle was the mother of Ishmael. She used a girdle so that she might hide her tracks from Sarah (by dragging it). Abraham brought her and her son Ishmael while she was suckling him to a place near the Kaba under a tree on the spot of ZamZam at the highest place in the mosque. During those days there was nobody in Mecca, nor was there any water so he made them sit over there and placed near them a leather bag containing some dates and a small water skin containing some water and set out homeward. Ishmael's mother followed him saying: "O Abraham! Where are you going, leaving us in this valley where there is no person whose company we may enjoy, nor is there anything to enjoy?" she repeated that to him many**

times, but he did not look back at her. Then she asked him: "Has Allah ordered you to do so?" He said: "Yes." She then said: "Then HE will not neglect us," and returned while Abraham proceeded onwards. On reaching the Thaniya where they could not see him, he faced the Kaba and raising both hands, invoked Allah saying the following prayers: "O our Lord! I have made some of my offspring dwell in a valley without cultivation, by Your Sacred House (Kaba at Mecca) in order, O our Lord that they may offer prayer perfectly. So fill some hearts among men with love towards them, and O Allah, provide them with fruits so that they may give thanks.”

Now from this Islamic narration, a great deal of light can be shed on the matter of the alleged abandonment of Hagar and Ishmael (P.B.U.H.). For example, the travel time from Beersheba to Mecca (wilderness of Paran) is approximately 3040.7 miles / 4893.5 km; i.e., a 6 hrs, 19 minute ride by airplane. Thus, it would have been impossible for Hagar and Ishmael (P.B.U.H.) to make it all the way to Mecca on a mere bottle of water. Furthermore, if one were to continue reading the bible, a detailed account of the lives of the key figures are illustrated; such as Isaac becoming an adult, Abraham remarrying and relocating, and even Ishmael and Isaac burying Abraham (peace be upon them). So, in light of this detailed information,

I raise the following question, if Abraham (P.B.U.H.) did in fact abandon Hagar and Ishmael (peace be upon them), how was it possible for Ishmael, after several decades without having any type of contact with either Abraham or Isaac (peace be upon them) to somehow find them and perform the burial service of his deceased father? It would be impractical to believe that this happened by mere coincidence would be impractical; especially in light of the fact that even with today's modern technology, very few abandoned/adopted children are able to locate their birth parents; how then could Ishmael accomplish this feat? The only explanation is that he was never abandoned.

The distance from either Mecca to caanan or Egypt (where Ishmael's mother was from) to Caanan is several hundred miles one way; so, even if someone were to suggest that Isaac (P.B.U.H.) sought out his older brother after their father died, it would have been impossible to make the return trip before Abraham's (P.B.U.H.) body began decomposing. To reiterate, the Quran says in Surah 14:37 which reads: **"O our Lord! I have made some of my offspring to dwell in a valley without cultivation, by Thy Sacred House; in order, O our Lord, that they may establish regular Prayer: so fill the hearts of some among men with love towards them, and feed them with fruits: so that they may give thanks.**" Thus, Abraham (P.B.U.H.) left his wife and son

(peace be upon them) in Mecca. This is the logical choice; meaning, based on the evidence, the Islamic version makes the most sense.

Abraham (P.B.U.H.) took his wife and son (peace be upon them) to Mecca and left them there. This explains how they were able to make it from Beersheba to the wilderness of Paran. They were merely left at Mecca with a bottle of water versus traveling across the desert with a bottle of water. Also, as the Islamic sources declare, Abraham (P.B.U.H.) maintained contact with his son (P.B.U.H.) throughout the years; as evident from Surah 2:127 which reads: **"And remember Abraham and Isma'il raised the foundations of the House (With this prayer): "Our Lord! Accept (this service) from us: For Thou art the All-Hearing, the All-knowing."** (Abraham and Ishmael rebuilt the Kaaba in Mecca)

In closing, one is free to believe as they choose, I merely wanted to give the viewers of this document something to think about. Peace!

The Lie that man evolved from other species versus being created by God

According to dictionary.com, (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/evolution) evolution is

defined as, "A theory first proposed in the nineteenth century by Charles Darwin, according to which the Earth's species have changed and diversified through time under the influence of natural selection. Life on Earth is thought to have evolved in three stages. First came chemical evolution, in which organic molecules were formed. This was followed by the development of single cells capable of reproducing themselves. This stage led to the development of complex organisms capable of sexual reproduction. Evolution is generally accepted as fact by scientists today, although debates continue over the precise mechanisms involved in the process." Quite naturally, a great deal of information and a number of theories have been purported over the past decades on the subject at hand, yet the premise remains the same; namely, that mankind was not created by God.

As a Muslim, I find the concept of evolution to be both blasphemous and insulting to the intellect. I feel so strongly against evolution because it is the only hypothesis that I am aware of which has managed to find itself on the lips of religious folk whom believe it to be a fact. It is embarrassing to say the least; i.e., just how misguided we God-fearing folk really are. Those who deny the validity of my assertion, I simply challenge them to walk up to a Jew, Christian, or Muslim and ask them to inform you as to whether the chicken or the egg

came first. There is no doubt in my mind that the vast majority of responders will either ponder over the question or even say that it was the egg which came first.

unfortunately, I am saddened to say that even among those whose reply is that the chicken came first, their reply is merely a byproduct of their reasoning, versus stating their answer as a fact which has been derived from their religious beliefs. With this being said, I feel like the main culprit for such widespread religious confusion is this secularly dominant society in which we live. An example of what I am referring to is the probability that most teenagers are aware of their zodiacal sign than their actual blood type.

Keep in mind that astrology is not a lawful practice among religious folk due to the fact that it purports the capability to determine future events (knowledge only possessed by God) via celestial bodies. However, astronomy on the other hand, which involves studying celestial bodies for the purpose of education about our universe and the cosmos, is supported. Nevertheless, it appears that religious folk are more knowledgeable about those matters which are not supported by their religion than they are with actual scripture and religious customs.

The ignorance stemming from adopted evolutionary beliefs and concepts has resulted in the phenomenon of many educated

religious folk unintentionally assimilating into a culture which has adopted the belief that humans belong to several racial subgroups. The foundation of their belief lies in evolutionary theories which purport that humans evolved as a result of environmental factors which molded their physical and molecular structure. Furthermore, evolution purports that as a result of certain phenotypes being prevalent in certain regions, isolation among specific traits from these organisms gave rise to the many racial groups which are commonly found on Earth today.

Personally, I feel as though the social construct of race is by itself enough for any educated person to laugh at, not to mention the fact that evolution also purports that prior to becoming humans, we were actually intermediaries of part-worm-part-fish, part-frog-part-snake, part-ape-part-bear, etc. This is impractical! In fact, it is down-right insulting. Nowhere on Earth, not even in the fossil record, is there any evidence that man is the byproduct of evolution. Interestingly enough, if humans are the byproduct of evolution, there would have been at least on transitional form present somewhere on Earth as evidence. However, this is not the case, all we see on this planet are countless varieties of species which have remained unchanged for as long as man has been on Earth.

Even the legendary Bigfoot, which is believed by some evolutionist to be a transitional form of half-man-half-ape has yet to be discovered. It is also worth mentioning that Oliver, the alleged Humanzee that walked upright and appeared to have a human-like motif (face and hairline) was later discovered to be a rare species of chimpanzee; due to the fact that it possessed 48 chromosomes versus 46 like normal humans. Even the alleged fossil remains of Piltdown Man, Lucy, and every other alleged evolutionary discovery has been debunked as being either forgeries or the remains of one of the more than 6000 extinct ape species.

As to those who feel like I am incorrect about evolution, I will not ask you to present an example of a transitional form to support your argument; rather, I will make it easy for you. All I ask is that the skeptics simply provide me with the molecular structure of an African-American, Mexican, Chinese, African, Russian, etc. The choice is yours as to which race you choose!

We know that water commonly has a molecular structure of H2O. However, one will never be able to produce the same type formula for a particular race. The reason why is because race simply does not exist. Humans only belong to nations and tribes; namely, we live in certain areas of the Earth and we belong to a certain group of ancestors who elected to reside in a particular

region. Therefore, if you take two people from 8 random countries, and place them in one area of the planet, they will have children who will be the descendants of these individuals. However, if these descendants were to be analyzed 500 years later, researchers would still not be able to derive a single molecular structure for these individuals, despite the fact that subjects in the experiment were assisted by several years of isolation among homogeneous environmental factors.

It is therefore important to note that humans are in fact as the name suggests, "hue-men;" i.e., men of various colors. All we have is our genetic makeup which is comprised of 23 chromosomes from each parent. Also since life originated in what is now referred to as Africa, we are all cousins; just as the monotheistic religions declare. One is either a dark-skinned or light-skinned member of the human race; i.e., hue-man. However, we were, are, and never will be crayons that can be distinguished by a specific molecular structure for a particular phenotype.

In closing, I ask the reader to ponder over what actually constitutes being a Caucasian other than laying claim to a particular geographic region. Does it mean possessing blond hair, white skin, and blue eyes? If so, does tanning one's skin make one a Cuban or Brazilian; because, a number of Brazilians

have brown skin, blue eyes, and blond hair. Furthermore, how is a person from India with very dark-skin, straight hair, and blue eyes categorized in the race spectrum? I am using this example because India has a cast system based on color which has unjustly divided the people of the country. However, the fact still remains that despite bleaching their skin and having blue eyes or blond hair, the palest skin Indian will never be considered as being a member of the white race. In fact, even the beloved Aryan master race of the Nazi's were actually the cousins of the above mentioned Indians.

Islam clearly states that mankind was created from a single pair of male and female; i.e., Adam and his wife, Eve (peace be upon them). Thus, they are the common ancestor that we all have in common. Interestingly enough, when a human donates blood, that donated blood is actually stored according to its type, not race. Thus, if races truly existed, I am certain that every effort would be taken to ensure that the blood remains segregated. Six million people died as a result of racial ignorance in the Holocaust. I pray that we hue-mans can learn from the mistakes of the past and eradicate the false social construct of race from this planet before it claims the lives of even more members of our hue-man family.

The Lie that "Jesus" is actually the true name of the Messiah (Christ)

I consider it extremely important to tackle this issue; because, for as long as I can remember, every Christian preacher that I have come into contact with adamantly refers to the Messiah as Jesus (P.B.U.H.) or the Christ while these are terms that were never applied to him while he was on Earth. I guess the point of the matter which I find most heartbreaking is the fact that as soon as I inform them that the letter "j" did not exist until more than a thousand years after Jesus (P.B.U.H.), the immediately declare that his name was Yeheshua; as if to imply that I am not telling them something which they did not know.

I consider the irony of the matter to be sacrilegious, to say the least. If the Christian authorities are aware that Jesus is a name that the Messiah never was called, then why purport this belief to the body of Christians whom are totally unaware of this fact. Especially, since his name was specifically mentioned in Matthew 1:21 of the Bible. It is therefore fair to summarize the matter as an act of deception and cultural imperialism at its best.

Bible historians claim that the scriptures were revealed in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Koine Greek. However, the name attributed

to the Messiah in Hebrew and Aramaic is Yeshua, while the Greek is rendered as Iesous; all generally meaning, "God is help/salvation." Furthermore, in the book titled, *The Mistaken J - True Names Of the Father and Son*, French historian, scholar, and archaeologist Ernest Renan is quoted as acknowledging that "the Savior was never in His lifetime called "Jesus;" and in his book, *The Life of Jesus*, on page 90, Renan is quoted as "doubting that the Savior even spoke Greek;" which was mostly the language of business and commerce in cosmopolitan circles.

With this being said, I guess that a more important question would be, if Matthew 1:21 says, "**And she shall bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name JESUS for he shall save his people from their sins;**" what then was the actual name used in this verse before the name Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was inserted? I am curious because the rules of every language on Earth clearly prohibit translating proper nouns such as personal names. Yet, the Bible translators clearly broke this rule when they inserted a name for the Messiah which is not even historically accurate; not to mention being a translation of a personal name. In fact, even to this very day there is no letter equivalent to "J" in either Hebrew or Greek.

Now, I guess I this is a good time to expound upon the deception even further. For example, the Bible historians claim

that the name Yeshua was a common name among the Jews, occurring twenty-nine times in the Hebrew and Aramaic Scriptures; once in First Chronicles, once in Second Chronicles, 10 times in Ezra, and 17 times in Nehemiah. However, I just cannot grasp the concept of why the Church leaders would continue to purport a false name for the Messiah while knowing full well that the Bible is clear in Acts 4:12 that, **"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."**

I know full well that God only judges mankind based on their intentions. Thus, every Christian who obeyed Jesus' (P.B.U.H.) teachings through that concocted name versus his true name will not be held accountable for their ignorance. Unfortunately, the false name of "Jesus" (P.B.U.H.) still remains on the lips of most American preachers and on the pages of English Bible translations. I understand that one cannot be certain as to the true name of the Messiah; however, I feel like every effort should be made to ascertain the truth. With this being said, one can perfect their worship by electing to refer to Jesus (P.B.U.H.) as either the Messiah or the son of Maryam (Mary), without showing the least bit of disrespect.

We Muslims on the other hand, refer to the Messiah as "almaseehu AAeesa ibnu maryama" (Mesiah Isa the son of Maryam

{Mary}). It is our belief that when Jesus (P.B.U.H.) returns during the final days that he will educate the people as to what his name truly is. Thus, we Muslim do not have to engage in trivial arguments with lexicons or historians whom know full well that there are gray areas (diglossia, lack of cognates, etc.) of their knowledge of the dead Aramaic, Hebrew, and Classical Arabic languages. As such, it is fruitless to engage them in discourses about the Quranic name for Jesus (P.B.U.H.); even though there are non-Muslim sources which concur with the Islamic name for Jesus (P.B.U.H.).

The Lie that Blacks are the cursed descendants of Noah's second son Ham

As one deemed an African-American by society, I am embarrassed to say that I did not discover the lie of the Ham Doctrine until after I converted to Islam at the age of 31. As a Christian, I was force-fed the lie that I, as an African-American was the cursed descendent of Ham, due to the color of my skin. I was a nominal Christian, so I never read the bible in its entirety or readily obeyed the laws within. In fact, I was always taught that I could not comprehend the gist of the scriptures. As a result, I considered it a waste of time to actually study the Bible, since I was indoctrinated into the belief that I could never fully comprehend it or question God

whenever a verse seemed confusing, contradictory, or impractical.

I can recall watching the Roots series on TV as a young man, and inquiring as to why the enslaved Black Africans were treated so harshly. To my surprise, I was informed that is was because we were believed to have been cursed by God to be the slaves of White people. I cannot explain to you the dismay I felt at that moment. Furthermore, once I discovered that millions of Blacks were enslaved over the course of several centuries, I figured that there had to be some truth to the matter; otherwise, how else could one explain millions of people being converted into chattel.

I am not saying that a group of enslavers could not travel to Africa and kidnap hundreds of people; my reasoning was that it would have been absolutely impossible to continue this deviant practice for several centuries without the inhabitants of that continent banding together to fight their common foe. I later discovered that this heinous crime was accomplished by exploiting inter-tribal beefs, religious differences, the greed of African profiteers, and the employment of manipulative and coercive tactics by the Dutch, British, Portuguese, etc. So, yes, Africans assisted in the enslavement of their brethren.

A number of years later while enrolled in college, I took an Ethics class wherein I was informed about the Doctrine of Original Sin. Once I discovered that I could have my sins erased and receive salvation simply by believing that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) died on the cross as a sacrifice for me and my fellow Christians, I figured that things could only improve for me. I then asked the instructor why did not the enslaved Africans testify to Jesus' (P.B.U.H.) sacrifice, so that they could have their condition improved. Unfortunately, my feeling of bliss was short lived. I became devastated, once I discovered that a testimony to Jesus' (P.B.U.H.) sacrifice could not eradicate the ill-treatment that the Black slaves were required to endure. In short, I was informed that Blacks had to fulfill the terms of the curse placed upon them by God. Furthermore, I was made aware that the extent of the curse was so severe, that any person with at least one drop of Black blood (one-drop rule) was cursed; therefore, regardless of a person's skin tone, they were to be enslaved if they had at least one Black ancestor.

The statements of the Professor really seemed a bit nonsensical. He professed that one's sins could be forgiven by accepting Jesus (P.B.U.H.) as their personal savior; yet, one could still not be forgiven for a sin which they never actually committed, if they had colored skin. I also found it strange

that none of the cursed attributes which plagued mankind was nonexistent; namely, mankind still had to work for a living, women still continue to experience pain while delivering babies, snakes continued to crawl on their bellies, and women were still subordinate to men in every recognized society. Just think about it, an alleged original sin resulting from the noncompliance of Adam and Eve (P.B.U.T), and a curse from Ham, none of which I had taken part of; yet, was liable nevertheless. The facts just were not adding up.

At that point, I felt like it was imperative to study the bible in order to decipher the inconsistency/contradiction of the Ham Doctrine being superior to Jesus' ability to forgive sins; especially, since I had read in Philippians 4:13 that one could do all things through Christ (P.B.U.H.). Disheartened, I seriously wondered why Jesus (P.B.U.H.) could not save the enslaved Africans when all power was allegedly given to him by God. I also found it strange how Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was always depicted as having Caucasian features, despite the fact that the Bible in Revelations 1:15 clearly says that he had skin like burnt brass; and that the Black Madonna and Child which the Popes of the Vatican pray in front of was a more realistic image of Mary and Jesus (peace be upon them). It almost appeared as though Jesus (P.B.U.H.) and every other prominent Biblical

figure was depicted as having white skin, so that Blacks could not use them as evidence to prove that God did not curse everyone with Black/colored skin; i.e., if Jesus is said to be sinless despite having skin like burnt brass, then the Black enslaved Africans could also use these facts as evidence that they too were free from God's curse.

In fact, history tells us that a miracle of Moses (P.B.U.H.) the Egyptian, was that he could turn his hand white (leprous). Logically, Moses (P.B.U.H.) had to possess Black/colored skin; otherwise, what kind of miracle would it be for him as a White man to turn his hand white; not to mention the fact that in Numbers 12:10 his sister Miriam was turned leprous by God for being a racist; i.e., turned white, a color other than her original skin tone. However, as a Muslim, Jesus' (P.B.U.H.) or any other Prophet of God's skin tone is irrelevant, it is their message which we consider important. This is why Islam prohibits Muslims from making images of God's Prophets (P.B.U.T.). With this being said, I consider it to be sacrilegious and downright hypocritical to dare go as far as to create an image of a Prophet/servant of God like Jesus (P.B.U.H.) which some Christians actually believe to be God in the flesh, and not make his likeness an actual representation of the description contained within the verses of the Bible.

Upon examining the verses which illustrated the alleged curse of Ham (P.B.U.H.), I discovered that God did not curse Ham (P.B.U.H.); rather, it was Noah (P.B.U.H.) who pronounced the curse; and Noah (P.B.U.H.) actually cursed his grandson Canaan (P.B.U.H.); not his son Ham (P.B.U.H.). Furthermore, Genesis 9:24 in the King James Version of the Bible reads, **"And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his <u>younger</u> son had done unto him."** However, the very same verse in the New International Version, which is based on more ancient manuscripts, reads: **"When Noah awoke from his wine and found out what his <u>youngest</u> son had done to him."**

In light of the conflicting wording of Genesis 9:24 from the two Bible sources, it becomes clear that Noah is addressing a different son in each Bible. Ham is the second son; i.e., the younger son; while Japheth is the youngest son. Now, only one can be correct or both are incorrect. Furthermore, for the first time I actually realized why the King James Version of the Bible was always considered to be the true word of God, while other versions were deemed less credible; despite being based on more accurate and ancient manuscripts. One of the reason, in my opinion, is because it depicts Ham as being the cursed son; i.e., justifying the enslavement of Black Africans.

Now, by this point one should be asking themselves this simple question; namely, if the Ham Doctrine is not found in the Bible, from where then did it originate? According to a number of historians, the doctrine originated from the Talmud Sanhedrin, 72 a – b, and 108 b. However, after examining the text, I was still unable to locate the doctrine. Nevertheless, despite my lack of success with locating the doctrine, Edith Sanders, author of *The Hamitic Hypothesis: Its Origins and Functions in Time Perspective*, declared that in the Talmud, it is stated, "The descendants of Ham are cursed by being black and having a change in their physical characteristics; namely, your grandchildren's hair shall be twisted into kinks, and their eyes red; again because your lips jested at my misfortune, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked, and their male members shall be shamefully elongated! Men of this race are called Negroes." Furthermore, Dr. Harold D. Brackman of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in California, in *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict: A History of Black-Jewish Relations through 1900*, his 1977 UCLA Ph.D. dissertation, on pages 80 - 81, which he later recanted, initially stated, "There is no denying that the [Jewish] Babylonian Talmud was the first source to read a Negrophobic content into the episode by stressing Canaan's fraternal connection with Cush." The Jewish scholars, he said, advanced two explanations for Ham and his children

being turned black. According to Brackman, "The more important version of the myth, however, ingeniously ties in the origins of blackness - and of other, real and imagined Negroid traits - with Noah's Curse itself. According to it, Ham is told by his outraged father that, because you have abused me in the darkness of the night, your children shall be born black and ugly; because you have twisted your head to cause me embarrassment, they shall have kinky hair and red eyes; because your lips jested at my exposure, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked with their shamefully elongated male members exposed for all to see..."

Lastly, on the subject at hand, Aylmer Von Fleischer in his book, *"Retake Your Fame: Black Contribution To World Civilization, Volume 1"* stated: "The notion of the Black pigmentation emerging as the result of a curse is seriously flawed. The curse was concocted by White (convert) Jewish scholars working on the Babylonian Talmud in the Sixth century A.D. and has served as a moral foundation for slave merchants." He further concluded that the justification for cursing Canaan instead of Ham, who actually saw him naked in a drunken state, is due to the fact that God had already blessed him in Genesis 9:1 which reads: "**And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.**"

The curse which Aylmer Von Fleischer claimed to be concocted by White Jewish scholars in a version of the Talmud which is now obsolete, reads as follows: "Now, I [Noah] cannot beget the fourth son whose children I would have ordered to serve you and your brothers! Therefore, it must be Canaan, your first born, whom they enslave. And since you have disabled me ... doing ugly things in Blackness of night, Canaan's children shall be born ugly and Black! Moreover, because you twisted your head around to see my nakedness, your grandchildren's hair shall be twisted into kinks, and their eyes red; again because your lips jested at my misfortune, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked, and their male members shall be shamefully elongated! Men of this race are called Negroes, their forefather Canaan commanded them to love theft and fornication, to be banded together in hatred of their masters and never to tell the truth."

With this being said, for the skeptic who may feel as though some of the earlier Jewish sources never manipulated scripture to condemn Black people, I suggest you read some excerpts from their religious books regarding Jesus and his mother (P.B.U.T.). For example, the Talmud Sanhedrin 106a reads: "She who was the descendant of princes and governors played the harlot with carpenters." Also in footnote #2 to Shabbath 104b of

the Soncino edition, it is stated that in the "uncensored" text of the Talmud it is written that Jesus' mother, "Miriam the hairdresser," had sex with many men. Furthermore, the Talmud Shabbat 104b, Sanhedrin 67a reads: "Jesus son of Stada is Jesus son of Pandira?" Rav Hisda said, "The husband was Stada and the lover was Pandera." "But was not the husband Pappos son of Yehuda and the mother Stada?" No, his mother was Miriam, who let her hair grow long and was called Stada. Pumbedita says about her: "She was unfaithful to her husband." Note the derogatory reference to her long hair; implying that she was a harlot; because, only prostitutes walked about with their hair uncovered.

Peter Schäfer, reiterates these defamatory accounts on pages 18 - 19 of his book, *Jesus in the Talmud*, wherein he stated, "The Talmud teaches that Jesus was a 'mamzer' (bastard) conceived adulterously in 'niddah' (menstrual filth) by a Roman soldier named Pandera [Kallah 51a] of a whore [Sanhedrin 106a]." The Quran however in Surah 3:42 reads: **"Behold! the angels said: 'O Maryam (Mary)! Allah hath chosen thee and purified thee-chosen thee above the women of all nations.'"** Thus, Mary (P.B.U.H.) is the only woman mentioned by name in the Quran. Also, this verse of the Quran shows that Mary was preferred by God over all other woman on Earth; yet, despite the honor that

the Quran bestows upon Mary and Jesus (P.B.U.T.) there are still some Christians who feel as though Muslims are their enemy.

Regarding the allegation that Mary (P.B.U.T.) committed adultery and was unchaste by having intercourse while menstruating, her honor is defended in Surah 66:12 of the Quran which reads: **"And Mary the daughter of 'Imran, who guarded her chastity; and We breathed into (her body) of Our spirit; and she testified to the truth of the words of her Lord and of His Revelations, and was one of the devout (servants).** Surah 3:45 adds further honor to Mary (P.B.U.H.) by proving that her son is not a bastard when it says: **"Behold! the angels said: "O Mary! Allah gives thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah.**

In Surah (chapter) 19:27 - 35, titled Maryam (Mary) which is named after the mother of Jesus (P.B.U.H.) gives a detailed account of what transpired once she returned to her people with a baby whose father was unknown to the them. These verses also depicts how Allah gave Jesus (P.B.U.H.) the miracle of speech as a newborn baby to defend the honor of his mother, in addition to making it clear that he was a Prophet of God who was always kind to his mother; despite the fact that the Bible depicts him as

always responding to his mother in a rude manner; such as calling her "woman" and saying "woman what am I to do with you," etc.

The excerpts from surah Maryam, beginning at verse 19:27 and ending with verse 19:35 reads as follows: **"At length she brought the (babe) to her people, carrying him (in her arms). They said: 'O Mary! truly an amazing thing hast thou brought! O sister of Aaron! Thy father was not a man of evil, nor thy mother a woman unchaste!' But she pointed to the babe. They said: 'How can we talk to one who is a child in the cradle?' He said: 'I am indeed a servant of Allah: He hath given me revelation and made me a prophet; And He hath made me blessed wheresoever I be, and hath enjoined on me Prayer and Charity as long as I live; (He) hath made me kind to my mother, and not overbearing or miserable; So peace is on me the day I was born, the day that I die, and the day that I shall be raised up to life (again)'! Such (was) Jesus the son of Mary: (it is) a statement of truth, about which they (vainly) dispute. It is not befitting to (the majesty of) Allah that He should beget a son. Glory be to Him! when He determines a matter, He only says to it, "Be", and it is."**

To summarize Islam's position on the mythological Ham Doctrine and the concocted social construct of race, I draw your

attention to Surah 49:13 which clearly says: **"O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honored of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things)."** Also, Surah 30:22 reads: **"And among His Signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the variations in your languages and your colors: verily in that are Signs for those who know."** Thus, the Quran makes it clear that Islam does not condone racism or specifies any race other than the human race.

It is also important to note that there is a hadith in the collection of Bukhari wherein the Prophet Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) used the example of an person who was a slave in his social position, and of Ethopian nationality to show that race and social status could not be used as an excuse to not obey a ruler of the Muslims. The hadith in question that was narrated by Anas reads: "The Prophet (P.B.U.H.) said, **"Listen and obey (your chief) even if an Ethiopian whose head is like a raisin were made your leader."**

Unfortunately, those with a sinister agenda to incite racial tension to disunite the Muslim Ummah (community) and

dissuade others from embracing Islam, have used this hadith to slander Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) and declare him a racist. Only if a reader of this hadith were to examine the preponderance of the evidence versus taking this single hadith out of context, the sinister culprits would not have accomplished their task. To my dismay, many people have been bamboozled. Nevertheless, I will attempt to shed some light on the matter.

Surah 105 of the Quran is titled Al-Fil (the elephant). This surah recounts the story of Abraha al-Ashram, the Ethiopian governor of Yemen, who detested the reverence that the Arabs held for the Kaaba. As a result, he built a large cathedral in Sanaa, the capital of Yemen, and ordered the Arabs to make pilgrimage there instead. The Arabs ignored his order and even desecrated his cathedral. In retaliation, Abraha assembled a large army equipped with elephants; hence the title of the Surah; i.e., Al-Fil (the elephant).

Abraha advanced with his army riding atop of an elephant towards Mecca with the sole objective of demolishing and desecrating the Kaaba. When the news arrived as to Abraha al-Ashram's intent, the tribes of Mecca united in defense. After meeting with Abdul Muttalib, the Prophet Mohammed's (P.B.U.H.) grandfather who informed Abraha that he was the owner of some items seized and was there for their return. However, he

declared that Allah was the owner of the Kaaba, and as such, would protect it if he wished. No sooner had the army reached the vicinity of the Kaaba, a dark cloud of small birds carrying three pebbles: two in its claws and one in its beak, rained down the pebbles destroying Abraha and his army.

This event occurred prior to the birth of Mohammed (P.B.U.H.). Then, as the Prophet of Islam, Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) informed the Muslims about a prophecy wherein the sacred Kaaba would be destroyed by the hands of an Ethiopian with thin legs. The prophecy is recorded in a hadith collected by Bukhari wherein Abu Huraira reported: **"Allah's Apostle (P.B.U.H.) said, "DhusSuwaiqatain (the thin legged man) from Ethiopia will demolish the Ka'ba."** Another narration describing this future event is recorded in the collection of Abu Dawud wherein Abdullah ibn ' Amr related that the Prophet (P.B.U.H.) said: **"Leave Habasha (Ethiopia) alone so long as they leave you alone, for none shall remove the treasure of the Ka'bah except for Dhu As-Suwaigatain who is from Habasha."**

Now, if one were to read these two ahadith along with the initial hadith which says to obey one's leader even if he were an Ethiopian with a head like a raisin, they would clearly see that racism towards Blacks is not being propagated. The issue is that since an Ethiopian had tried to destroy the kaaba (Abraha)

and will eventually accomplish this task (DhusSuwaiqatain), Prophet Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) simply took measures to ensure that discrimination did not occur against a person simply because they were of Ethiopian descent; hence, his statement: "Leave Habasha (Ethiopia) alone so long as they leave you alone."

Regarding the raisin head comment. This statement of the hadith is perhaps referring to the incident wherein Prophet Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) appointed Usamah Ibn Zaid (P.B.U.H.) as General of the Muslim army; thus, making him the youngest person to ever hold this leadership position. Usamah (P.B.U.H.) was the son of Zaid Ibn Haritha (P.B.U.H.), the former freed slave and adopted son of Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) and Barakah Umm Ayman (P.B.U.H.) an Abyssinian (Ethiopian) maidservant of Mohammed's (P.B.U.H.) father whom Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) considered as his second mother. It is also important to note that Usamah (P.B.U.H.) had a snub-nose, black skin, and looked very much like his Abyssinian (Ethiopian) mother.

The ahadith which documented the events in question include a hadith in the collection of Bukhari wherein Salim's father narrated: "**The Prophet (P.B.U.H.)appointed Usama (P.B.U.H.)as the commander of the troops (to be sent to Syria). The Muslims spoke about Usama (unfavorably). The Prophet (P.B.U.H.)said, 'I have been informed that you spoke about Usama. (Let it be known**

that) he is the most beloved of all people to me.'"

Furthermore, a similiar hadith in the collection of Bukhari narrated by Abdullah bin 'Umar reports: "**Allah's Apostle(P.B.U.H.) sent troops and appointed Usama bin Zaid (P.B.U.H.)as their commander. The people criticized his leadership. Allah's Apostle got up and said, 'If you (people) are criticizing his (i.e. Usama's) leadership you used to criticize the leadership of his father before. By Allah, he (i.e. Zaid) deserved the leadership indeed, and he used to be one of the most beloved persons to me, and now this (i.e. his son, Usama) is one of the most beloved persons to me after him.**"

Thus, a careful analysis suggests that Usamah's father Zaid possibly experienced discrimination due to being a former slave, while Usama on the other hand as a result of being deemed too inexperienced/young (raisin or small head); or because of his resemblance to his Ethiopian mother. Allah knows best!

To support my implication that the disapproval of the companions regarding Usama's (P.B.U.H.) promotion was based on his inexperience as a leader, I present the hadith of Tirmidhi wherein Abdullah Ibn Umar (P.B.U.H.) complained to his father about Usamah (P.B.U.H.) receiving a larger share of the war booty than him; despite the fact that he performed better at battle. The hadith in question was narrated by Umar ibn al-

Khattab wherein he reported: "**Umar allotted to Usamah three thousand five hundred and to Abdullah ibn Umar three thousand, so Abdullah ibn Umar said to his father, 'Why have you treated Usamah as superior to me? I swear by Allah that he has never reached to any battle before me.' He replied, 'It is because Zayd was dearer to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) than your father and Usamah was dearer to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) than you, so I have given preference to the one who was beloved by Allah's Messenger over the one who is loved by me.'**"

No Muslim can deny that racism existed among the companions of the Prophet (P.B.U.H.); however, at the same time, nobody can deny the fact that Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) never condoned those distasteful actions or treated any of his Black companions harshly/discriminated against them. In fact, he elevated them. For example, the 31st Surah of the Quran is dedicated to Luqman (P.B.U.H.) the former Nubian slave who is referenced as a man of faith, wisdom, and intellect. Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) also appointed Bilal Ibn Rabah (P.B.U.H.), another former slave as the first Muadhin (caller to prayer) over all his Meccan born Arab companions. Furthermore, Usamah (P.B.U.H.) himself even testified in a hadith collected by Bukhari to the love that Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) displayed towards him. The hadith in

question reads as follows: **"The Prophet (P.B.U.H.) used to take him (i.e. Usama) and Al-Hassan (in his lap) and say: "O Allah! Love them, as I love them..."**

In view of these facts, everyone must be honest and admit that no other Way of life on Earth has benefits people of color and humanity as a whole as does Islam. There are good and bad people of every skin tone. One has to remember that the Transatlantic slave trade was accomplished through the aid of some Black Africans. Nevertheless, it is also important to note that Blacks were actually emancipated from slavery through the aid of some White abolitionist while some Black slaves played the role of overseer, exploiting and abusing their Black brethren. Therefore, there are no cursed people in Islam; neither by the Ham doctrine as people of color nor as being White devils as some have unjustifiably attributed to everyone with white skin.

It is therefore important to note that Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) made his position on racism publicly known in his last sermon via the following words: **"O People, lend me an attentive ear, for I know not whether after this year, I shall ever be amongst you again. Therefore, listen to what I am saying to you very carefully and take these words to those who could not be present here today. O People, just as you regard this month, this day,**

this city as Sacred, so regard the life and property of every Muslim as a sacred trust. Return the goods entrusted to you to their rightful owners. Hurt no one so that no one may hurt you. Remember that you will indeed meet your Lord, and that He will indeed reckon your deeds. God has forbidden you to take usury (interest), therefore all interest obligation shall henceforth be waived. Your capital, however, is yours to keep. You will neither inflict nor suffer any inequity. God has Judged that there shall be no interest, and that all the interest due to Abbas ibn Abd'al Muttalib shall henceforth be waived... Beware of Satan, for the safety of your religion. He has lost all hope that he will ever be able to lead you astray in big things, so beware of following him in small things. O People, it is true that you have certain rights with regard to your women, but they also have rights over you. Remember that you have taken them as your wives only under a trust from God and with His permission. If they abide by your right then to them belongs the right to be fed and clothed in kindness. Do treat your women well and be kind to them for they are your partners and committed helpers. And it is your right that they do not make friends with any one of whom you do not approve, as well as never to be unchaste. O People, listen to me in earnest, worship God, perform your five daily prayers, fast during the month of Ramadan, and offer Zakat. Perform Hajj if you have the

means. All mankind is from Adam and Eve. An Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab, nor does a non-Arab have any superiority over an Arab; white has no superiority over black, nor does a black have any superiority over white; [none have superiority over another] except by piety and good action. Learn that every Muslim is a brother to every Muslim and that the Muslims constitute one brotherhood. Nothing shall be legitimate to a Muslim which belongs to a fellow Muslim unless it was given freely and willingly. Do not, therefore, do injustice to yourselves. Remember, one day you will appear before God and answer for your deeds. So beware, do not stray from the path of righteousness after I am gone. O People, no prophet or apostle will come after me, and no new faith will be born. Reason well, therefore, O people, and understand the words which I convey to you. I leave behind me two things, the Quran and my example, the Sunnah, and if you follow these you will never go astray. All those who listen to me shall pass on my words to others and those to others again; and it may be that the last ones understand my words better than those who listen to me directly. Be my witness, O God, that I have conveyed your message to your people."

The Lie that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) Christ is God and a part of the trinity

Last, but definitely not least, I elected to save the most important topic of this document until the very end. Also, since the Bible is the only book that Christians consider to be the true word of God, I will use only the verses contained within as evidence to support my position.

For starters, if one were to read the genealogy of Jesus (P.B.U.H.) they would clearly see that Luke 3:23 begins with Jesus and ends at verse 3:38 which reads: **"Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."** Thus, Jesus' (P.B.U.H.) genealogy was literally traced back to God. So, in this instance, my question is this, how could Jesus (P.B.U.H.) possibly trace his genealogy back to God if they are in fact the same person? Also in John 6:38 Jesus (P.B.U.H.) reportedly said, **"I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."** Thus, Jesus (P.B.U.H.) has a separate will from the Creator.

If one were also to read the Lord's Prayer it would become obvious that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is again suggesting that God has a separate will from him. The Lord's Prayer in Matthew 6:9 - 13 reads as follows: **"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom**

come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen." In the above mentioned prayer, the word thy actually equates to the modern English word "your." Hence, "your will" is addressing a will other than Jesus'.

Now, for the skeptic who feels as though I am trying to play on words while knowing full well that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was actually referring to himself, I draw your attention to John 10:27 which reads: "**My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.**" Notice that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is now using the word my, which is in the first person tense to refer to himself. However, in the above mentioned Lord's Prayer, Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is speaking in the second person tense when he uses the words thy, thou, and thine to refer to God. Also, regarding the alleged crucifixion of Jesus (P.B.U.H.), in Mark 15:34, we can clearly see that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is calling out to his God; suggesting that they are not one and the same. The verse in question reads as follows: "**And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?**" Thus, he is clearly not speaking to himself.

Perhaps the strongest evidence from the Bible which proves that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is not God is in fact his actual statements from John 5:37 in which he reportedly said, **"And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape."** Now Jesus (P.B.U.H.) who is my greatest witness in this instance is actually recorded as saying that God, the father has sent him and that at no time has anyone heard his (God's) voice or seen his shape. Yet, the verse clearly depicts the people as looking at him and listening to his voice while he is speaking. Thus, Jesus (P.B.U.H.) and God are clearly not the same person. This is why Jesus (P.B.U.H.) became angry with Philip (P.B.U.H.) when he asked him to show him God. The incident which I am referring to is found in John 14:8 - 10 which reads: **"Philip said unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it will satisfy us. Jesus said unto him, Have I been so long a time with you, and yet have you not known me, Philip? he that has seen me has seen the Father; and how say you then, Show us the Father? Believe you not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwells in me, he does the works."** Now, based on this verse, it is clear that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is admonishing Philip (P.B.U.H.) because he is asking him to do something which is utterly impossible. As a disciple, who was with Jesus (P.B.U.H.) when he

said that at no time has anyone seen God or heard his voice (John 5:37), Philip (P.B.U.H.) should have known better. Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is basically making it clear that anyone can figuratively see God in him by the miracles he had performed and the revelation he received. It is the same as when Jesus (P.B.U.H.) said that the Comforter (P.B.U.H.) will not speak of his own but only what he hears from God; i.e., revelation. Another reason why Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was angry with Philip (P.B.U.H.) is because it was even known during the time of Moses (P.B.U.H.) that no man could see God and live. This fact is evident from Exodus 33:20 which reads: **"And he (God) said, You (Moses) cannot see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live."**

Regarding the claim that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) is actually part of a trinity, I will begin by defining the actual term. according to Encyclopedia Britannica, the Trinity is defined as follows:"In Christian doctrine, the unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Holy Ghost) as three persons in one Godhead." Therefore, it is purported that God, Jesus (P.B.U.H.), and the Holy Spirit are actually one and the same and totally equal in power and authority.

To address this claim I will begin by quoting Isaiah 40:28 which reads: **"Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the**

everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding." Now, based on the description of God from this verse, one is made aware of the fact that God does not become tired or weary and his being and power is beyond our comprehension. However, in Matthew 8:24 - 25 Jesus is recorded as being asleep while on the boat. The verse reads as follows: **"Without warning, a furious storm came up on the lake, so that the waves swept over the boat. But Jesus was sleeping. The disciples went and woke him, saying, "Lord, save us! We're going to drown!"** Also, according to Luke 4:2 Jesus (P.B.U.H.) became hungry. Furthermore, in Matthew 21:18 - 19, in addition to again suffering from hunger Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was also unaware of the fact that the fig tree had no fruit. Therefore, it is clear that although Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was a mighty messenger of God, he was in no way equal with God in knowledge and power; because, he verified this fact in Matthew 24:36 when he said that nobody except God had knowledge of when the actual Day of Judgment would occur; not even him.

The Bible in John 14:28 also makes it clear that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) and God are not equal when Jesus (P.B.U.H.) was quoted as saying that the father is greater than I, and saying that the father is greater than all in John 10:29. In fact, John

10:29 also makes it clear that God is superior to both Jesus and the Holy Spirit when it says that the father is greater than "all." Furthermore, the Holy Spirit is also superior to Jesus (P.B.U.H.) with regard to blasphemy in that one can blaspheme against Jesus (P.B.U.H.) and be forgiven; however, blasphemy against the Holy spirit is unforgivable. The verse proving this fact is Luke 12:10 which reads: **"And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven."** Thus, in addition to God being superior to Jesus (P.B.U.H.) and the holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost is superior to Jesus (P.B.U.H.) regarding the act of blasphemy.

In closing, I would like to make it clear that in no way form or fashion was it my intent to insult any Prophet of God (P.B.U.T.), any Christian, Muslim, or Jew; or even the religious beliefs of anyone. I am merely trying to expose the fallacies which are dividing mankind. Racism and religion only divide people. God revealed a Way of life for mankind. Islam in the Arabic language simply means submission to the Way of life that God has ordained for man. This Way in Islam is called Deen. This Deen or Way is the same belief system that Jesus and his followers were upon. The evidence supporting this fact is the Bible itself. If one were to read the accounts of Paul before he

allegedly turned his life over to God, one will notice that he was quoted in Acts 22:4 as saying that he used to persecute followers of the Way. The verse in question reads as follows: **"I persecuted the followers of this Way to their death, arresting both men and women and throwing them into prison."** It was not until after Jesus (P.B.U.H.) that his enemies began referring to his followers as Christians; which was intended to be an insult. However, there is no documentation in Christianity that Jesus (P.B.U.H.) ever used this title to refer to either him or his followers. In fact, we Muslims believe that all of God's Prophets (P.B.U.H.) were Muslims; even the disciples of Jesus (P.B.U.H.) which is evident from Surah 3:52 which reads: **"When Jesus found Unbelief on their part He said: 'Who will be My helpers to (the work of) Allah?' Said the disciples: 'We are Allah's helpers: We believe in Allah, and do thou bear witness that we are Muslims.'"**

Now, for the skeptic who might inquire as to if God did not leave any particular name for the followers of Jesus (P.B.U.H.), why then do followers of Islam refer to themselves as Muslims? In Islam, one who actively submits their will to the Way (Deen) of God is being a Mu-Islam (Muslim). Mu in Arabic is used to make a verb into the person who does the action. The verb appears before the word. For example, the call to prayer in

Islam is referred to as the adhan. Therefore, the one who actively begins calling the adhan to assemble the people for prayer is known as the mu-adhan or mu'aḏḏin; as such, one who is engaging in the act of submitting their will to God (Islam) is being a Mu-Islam or Muslim.

As one can clearly see, when translating a word into English from Arabic, the pronunciation is what is most important; thus, it is common to see several spelling variations for a particular word. In view of these facts, it should now be clear that we Muslims are merely addressing ourselves using the Arabic language; i.e., saying the Arabic word Deen versus the English word Way. Lastly, the reason why Muslims utilize the Arabic language is because the language still belongs to the people. The language existed before Mohammed (P.B.U.H.) was even born; proving that he did not add anything; nor can anything be taken away or created by modern lexicons without it being detected and exposed by the Arabic speaking peoples of the world. This is extremely advantageous for a worshiper; thus, nobody can manipulate the Quran, our religious book.